1	THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
2	MIAMI DIVISION
3	CASE NO.: 23-cv-21377-DPG
4	CASE NO 23-CV-21377-DFG
5	
6	
7	PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP,
8	Plaintiff, September 29, 2023
9	V
10	MICHAEL D. COHEN, Pages 1 - 15
11	Defendant.)
12	·
13	
14	DISCOVERY HEARING
15	(Via Zoom)
16	BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWIN G. TORRES
17	UNITED STATES CHIEF MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18	
19	
20	
21	APPEARANCES:
22	Counsel on behalf of the Plaintiff:
23	BRITO, PLLC 2121 Ponce de Leon Boulevard
24	Suite 650, Coral Gables, FL 33134
25	BY: ALEJANDRO BRITO, ESQ.

1	
2	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
3	Counsel on behalf of the Defendant:
4	BRODSKY FOTIU-WOJTOWICZ PLLC
5	169 E. Flagler Street , Suite 1224, Miami, FL 33133
6	BY: BENJAMIN H. BRODSKY, ESQ. BY: MAX A. EICHENBLATT, ESQ.
7	DI. HAX A. LICHENDEATT, ESQ.
8	
9	E. DANYA PERRY PLLC
10	157 East 86th Street, 4th Floor,
11	New York, NY 10028. BY: LILIAN M. TIMMERMAN, ESQ.
12	BY: E. DANYA PERRY, ESQ. (Telephonically) BY: ALEXANDER NOCKS, ESQ. (<i>Pro hac vice</i>)
13	DI. MELANIDER NOORO, LOQ. (110 Mac V100)
14	
15	
16	Transcribed By:
17	BONNIE JOY LEWIS, R.P.R. 7001 SW 13 Street
18	Pembroke Pines, FL 33023 954-985-8875
19	caselawrptg@gmail.com
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
(Thereupon, the following proceeding was held:)
 1
 2
            THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: The United States District
 3
   Court is now in session. The Honorable Chief Magistrate Judge
   Edwin G. Torres presiding.
 4
 5
             Calling case Donald J. Trump versus Michael D. Cohen;
   Case Number 23-cv-21377-Gayles.
 6
 7
             Counsel, please state your appearances for the record
   starting with the Plaintiff.
 9
            MR. BRITO: Good afternoon. Alejandro Brito on behalf
   of the Plaintiff.
10
11
            MS. TIMMERMANN: Good afternoon.
12
             Lilian Timmermann, Donya Perry, and Alexander Nocks on
   behalf of the Defendant Mr. Michael Cohen.
13
14
            MR. BRODSKY: And Ben Brodsky and Max Eichenblatt on
   behalf of the Defendant.
15
16
             THE COURT: Good afternoon. Are we waiting on anybody
   else?
17
18
            MR. BRITO: No, not on the Plaintiff's side, Your
19
   Honor.
20
            MS. TIMMERMANN: Not on the Defense side either, Your
21
   Honor.
22
            THE COURT: Okay. I do believe there was a couple of
   people who wanted to appear from the media. So I will give
23
24
   them a moment just in case.
25
             I am not sure why my avatar is on as well as me. So I
```

```
can't figure that out. Let's assume it is a reporter.
 1
 2
             Oh, is that you, Trina?
 3
            THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes, it is, Judge.
 4
            THE COURT: Got you. Okay. I didn't understand that.
 5
   Got you.
 6
                   There is one person coming on. Hold on.
             Okay.
                                                              Okay.
 7
   You got it. Great.
 8
             Okay. Good afternoon, everybody.
             Thank you for your appearances. I believe that
 9
10
   everybody who needed to be on the Zoom is now on as I am
11
   seeing.
12
             We adjourned yesterday with respect to the issue of
   the deposition location. And as I recall, the Defendants were
13
14
   going to caucus about the pending proposal and let me know the
   preferences, I think. I think that's where we left it.
15
16
            MS. TIMMERMANN:
                             Yes.
17
            THE COURT: Is that right?
18
            MS. TIMMERMANN: That's right, Your Honor.
19
             And we have just submitted to you, just a few minutes
20
   ago, a proposed order memorializing our preferences and the
21
   Defendant's preferences.
22
             Having spoken about October 9th, Columbus Day, the
   court holiday is the preference and New York City is going to
23
24
   be better for us. We are pinning down the venue and we are in
25
   the process of that and we just ask that we have until the
```

Monday of next week to give a new deposition notice with the correct venue. We just want to make sure that we sign the contract and have everything set in place and then that will give Plaintiff a week to get a security detail to do all of their rigamarole.

And we also put into that the Plaintiff will be responsible for additional fees incurred beyond this point essentially as a result of the repeated change of locations; locations and dates.

And I will note, though, that counsel for Plaintiff has stated that it is his preference or the Plaintiff's preference not to do it on the 9th. They want to do it on the 8th. They did not provide us with any reason for that.

As we noted, the only reason for this move is Your Honor's wise counsel to not go headlong into conflict with the trial in New York, but on that Monday there should be no conflict. It is a court holiday.

So that is our preferences. That is what we have put into the order. We have tried to capture sort of the language of the decision to move the date in that order, but we understand that you may not have had a chance to look at it since we just sent it to you.

THE COURT: Okay. And did you have any -- have there been, as far as you know now, any costs from having to cancel the October 2nd venue?

MS. TIMMERMANN: Yes. So, the October 3rd venue, yes.

We had confirmed ahead of time that the cancellation period was already outside of it. We have let the Four Seasons know that we were not going to go and are now in the process of closing that out.

So we will know exactly the fees, but as far as we knew even when we signed the contract, given how close it was to the date, there was not going to be any -- the cancellation fees is the full amount.

But I will confirm that and we have put into the order that we are responsible for providing the Plaintiff with the full invoices and everything so that they can verify the cost that we are asking them to reimburse us for.

THE COURT: Turning to counsel for Mr. Brito, any problem with that?

MR. BRITO: Yes, Your Honor.

I had reached out to counsel early this morning to find out about what their preference was and didn't hear back until just a little while ago that now, inconsistent with what we had talked about yesterday, now the preference is October 9th, that Monday.

Where, as Your Honor will recall initially, they had represented to the Court that Mr. Brodsky's unavailability the 9th may not be something that was available or being offered. So it was October 8th.

2

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I had represented to the Court, well, maybe we can look into that, but I never spoke to my client about the 9th when I went outside your courtroom to caucus.

Subsequent to that I communicated to counsel that the 9th was not an option and I made that very clear first thing this morning. The representation by Miss Timmermann that we have not provided an explanation is simply not true.

I e-mailed her along with Miss Perry and Mr. Brodsky advising them that there is a scheduling conflict on the 9th. My client, as everyone knows, is running for President of the United States and Columbus Day is an issue on the 9th.

We are still available on the 8th, which was the date that the Defendant requested. And I said we will still make ourselves available on the 8th and we will still make ourselves available on the 15th if that is something that would alleviate whatever the problem is that the 8th now presents.

That and the issue of the 8th no longer being available is clearly something that has not been articulated to me or to this Court. Yesterday they said the 8th is the day. And now, apparently, it is no longer something that they want to live by where we are still available and are agreeable to what we talked about.

My understanding, Judge, was simply it is on the 8th. Is it in New York or is it in Palm Beach? The sides need to agree on that on that location. We are still willing and still

ready to hear the answer to that question because it hasn't 1 2 been answered all morning by the Defendants. And to the extent that that still poses a problem, I am giving them an alternative date of the 15th, but I cannot offer the 9th to 5 them. 6 It should not be that complicated. There are two 7 Sundays that we have offered to make ourselves available. Neither of which the Defendant is willing to accept for reasons that are unbeknownst to me when yesterday the 8th was 10 available. THE COURT: And what is the conflict on the 9th? 12 MR. BRITO: He is traveling to some sort of an event 13 that he has to attend. I don't know the specifics of it, but 14 it is associated with the campaign and it is prearranged. There has already been all sorts of arrangements made for that 15 16 particular day. 17 THE COURT: Well, the record will reflect that you 18 indicated on the record yesterday that the dates that you were 19 proposing was the 8th or the 9th. And then Mr. Brodsky said he 20 would move his schedule to the 9th and they would confer about it. So I think that is what happened yesterday. 22 MR. BRITO: I had offered it myself without conferring with my client, Your Honor, just to be candid because I knew 23 24 that it was Columbus Day, but then Mr. Brodsky said, no, it is

11

21

25

not available.

So I never even asked my client when I went outside. I only asked about the 8th. The 8th was available. It was just a function of figuring out which would make more sense, New York or Palm Beach.

After we finished in court yesterday, I asked my client and they said the 9th was not available. I communicated that to Defense counsel and that is where we stand.

I was just proposing it because, as I mentioned to the Court, it is Columbus Day and so maybe that was a date that makes sense. Not being aware of the fact that the 9th was not available. It was just a suggestion on my part and not something I was offering as an available date.

THE COURT: Well, since I was basically accommodating the Plaintiff in moving it to begin with. And I generally don't force people to take depositions on a Sunday unless there is an agreement and there was an agreement at one point, but now they prefer to do it on the 9th.

So as between the 3rd and the 9th, which do you think your client would prefer, Mr. Brito?

MR. BRITO: I will need to ask that question because it is a rock and a hard place because the 3rd I have already articulated the reasons why that is a problem. The 9th I have been told it is simply not available.

I don't know if that is also an immovable issue on my client's end. I was just told that's not available. I said,

fine, it doesn't really matter because the Defendant's are asking for the 8th anyway and, if not, we will offer the 15th.

And again, I don't want to belabor the point too much, but it hasn't been communicated to me why the 8th, the desired date that was offered yesterday is no longer on the table on the Defendant's side.

It seems a matter of convenience more so than inability to be there. There is no conflict that I am hearing from the Defendant's side. They just prefer and it is easier for the schedule of Miss Perry to do it on the 9th than on the 8th. That is a bit different than there's a hard conflict and can't make it.

I've got prearranged events and that's not what I am hearing. It is just a preference on a schedule. So I have to ask the client the question about how immovable is the 9th.

THE COURT: Miss Timmermann.

MS. TIMMERMANN: Yes. And so, I mean, I think Your Honor articulated it exactly.

The only reason we are moving this is for the Plaintiff's convenience. It is incredibly inconvenient for us to do it on the 8th, the 9th, and any other day other than the 3rd, which is the day that we had agreed to and planned for.

I understand, again, we have been very understanding where, you know, the Plaintiff has decided at the last minute after knowing for over a year that the exact date of the trial

that has not moved in over a year. He has decided that now he must attend in person.

And you know, Your Honor agreed to let him move it and I think that is already very generous. We have scrambled to try to make accommodations. To be clear, it is as immovable for us as it is for the Plaintiff.

Mr. Trump doesn't have to do, you know, any of his campaign events any more than we have to do the birthdays, you know, the client meetings, the court hearings. Everything that has been moved to make it possible to do these dates.

And we can go through all five of our different scheduling conflicts. The travel and everything that needed to happen for us to be able to accommodate either the 8th or the 9th.

Now the of 9th is the day that allows to us have court reporters, have venue, and have Miss Perry available. To have everyone who needs to be that is essential to this at the same time in New York that's the 9th.

And I don't think that there is any basis for requiring us to jump through more hoops to accommodate something that is moveable. It is a campaign event and it is not an act of God.

It is not something that cannot change. A trial date, you know, there is a Judge that has set it and we understand that it would be unreasonable to force New York to have to make

a choice between having Mr. Trump there or not. We understand that position.

But, again, it was never available to us, the 8th or the 9th. We made ourselves available. We have moved heaven and earth.

This morning I agree that Plaintiff's counsel did communicate that it was a preference to do it on the 8th and not the 9th. He said it was unavailable. But, again, a campaign event is not unavailable and the campaign point is the first time we are hearing it is on the zoom.

Either way we think that the 9th is an appropriate date. We have made the accommodation. There is no trial on that date and we have everyone available and in place and ready to go for that day.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, since I am not going to play Ping-Pong with scheduling issues that are created by changes of position of the Plaintiff or the Defendant, for that matter.

So the Plaintiff indicated the 8th and 9th as an alternative to the 3rd. The Plaintiff indicated that they could do the 8th and were checking into the 9th. The Defendant now wants to did it on the 9th, which was one of the dates that was made available on the record.

And I don't normally force people to take depositions on a Sunday. So acts of agreement, of course. So we don't have an agreement. So I guess under the circumstances, since

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

nothing has yet been finally cancelled for the 3rd, there is no reason that I can't give Mr. Brito an opportunity to revisit that with his client to see if what is more important for him. I also believe the Plaintiff can opt out of this proposal and just stay with the current order that it has in That is fine with me too. That way there is no cancellation fee and we can move on. So why don't I give you an hour, Mr. Brito, and file a response on the docket as to the Plaintiff's position with respect to the 3rd or the 9th. And then I will incorporate that into the order that I will enter this afternoon. And then, I will require that the notice be sent on Monday in compliance with that order so that way the location can be clear, obviously, if we are doing it in New York. If we are doing it on the 3rd in West Palm Beach, then, the notice is already out, correct? And that has the location and the time and all that? MS. TIMMERMANN: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: So we only need an amended notice if we are going to move it to the 9th in New York City at the Plaintiff's request. Okay. So I will give you an hour to file a response to the proposed order. Did you file that on the docket already, Miss Timmermann, or were you going to?

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

25

```
MS. TIMMERMANN: I believe we only sent it to -- and
   Ben, I think you can confirm, but I think we only sent it to
   Your Honor and we can file it now.
            THE COURT: Okay. File it as a motion for entry of
   revised -- or whatever you want to call it. Motion for entry
   of revised deposition.
            MS. TIMMERMANN: Yes.
            THE COURT: Whatever.
            And then, that way Mr. Brito has something to respond
   to on the docket.
            MS. TIMMERMANN: Perfect. We will do. Thank you,
   Your Honor.
            THE COURT: And then, I will wait for that before I
   incorporate it into the order.
14
             And then, you all send me a proposed order already on
   the other things we did yesterday or that is still in the
   process?
            MS. TIMMERMANN: That's in process for 5:00 p.m. today
19
   if that is all right with Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Okay. I just wanted to check. Okay.
            MS. TIMMERMANN: Thank you.
            THE COURT: Other than that issue, then, is there
   anything else that we need to do? That was pretty much it,
23
24
   right?
            MS. TIMMERMANN: Those were the two issues.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
 1
             Thank you all very much for your participation.
 2
                                                                Thank
   you everybody who also joined in and then I will adjourn the
 3
 4
   proceeding at this point.
 5
             Thank you.
 6
             MS. TIMMERMANN:
                              Thank you, Your Honor.
 7
             MR. BRITO: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
             (Thereupon, the proceedings concluded.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

í	
1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	
4	I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is an
5	accurate transcript of the audiotape recorded proceedings in
6	the above-entitled matter.
7	
8	
9	
10	10/06/23 Bonnie Joy Lewis,
11	Registered Professional Reporter CASE LAW REPORTING, INC.
12	7001 Southwest 13 Street, Pembroke Pines, Florida 33023
13	954-985-8875
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	